



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/890,570	09/25/2001	Geroge Roland Hill	P268453	4578
75	90 12/18/2002			
Pillsbury Winthrop LLP			EXAMINER	
1600 Tysons Bo McLEAN, VA			LORENGO, JERRY A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1734	11
			DATE MAILED: 12/18/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			144
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	7
	09/890,570	HILL ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jerry A. Lorengo	1734	
<ul> <li>The MAILING DATE of this communication app</li> <li>Period for Reply</li> </ul>	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence addres:	ş
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timety. In the mailing date of this commur ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ication.
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<del>_</del> ·		
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ Th	is action is non-final.		
Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims			erits is
4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw			
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>24 and 25</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	т.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accept			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on		oved by the Examiner.	
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	•		
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex-	aminer.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: —			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents			
2. Certified copies of the priority documents			
<ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International But</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		е
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	c priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(	e) (to a provisional app	lication).
<ul> <li>a)  The translation of the foreign language pro</li> <li>15)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesting</li> </ul>			
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152	

Art Unit: 1734

. •

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

(1)

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 24 discloses a process of imaging an imperforate substrate comprising the general steps of: applying a base layer to the imaging surface of a substrate; applying at least two continuous superimposed layers of a marking material onto the base layer; removing portions of the superimposed layers of marking material while they are supported by the base layer; and removing the base layer from the substrate whereby at least one of the two layers of marking material is applied to the substrate.

It is not understood, however, how at least one of the two layers of marking material can be applied to the substrate when, according to claim 24, the marking material layers are supported on the base layer which is interposed between the layers of marking material and the substrate. Clarification is required.

(2)

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 1734

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,321,778 to Whitehead in view of U.S. Patent No. 1,199,882 to Frey.

Whitehead discloses a process of imaging an imperforate substrate having a substantially uniform imaging surface (glass) to form a one-way vision panel comprising the steps of (Figures 1-3; column 43-45; column 3, lines 3-28):

- (1) Providing a glass substrate;
- (2) Applying at least two layers of marking material (white and black layers of ink) in an imagewise pattern (dots) on the substrate; and
  - (3) Firing the substrate to fuse the layers of marking material to the substrate.

Although Whitehead discloses that the starting substrate (the glass panel) is transmuted (tempered) upon firing, he does not specifically disclose, as per applicant claim 25, that the two layers of marking material are applied to the starting substrate continuously, followed by removal of portions of the marking material by a force selectively supplied to the marking material while it is supported by the substrate.

Nonetheless, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of whitehead to provide the two layers of marking material on the substrate in a continuous manner motivated by the fact that Frey, also drawn to methods of forming a one-way vision panel (a mirror), discloses that it is known to apply at least two layers of marking material 2,3 in a continuous manner across the surface of a glass panel 1 followed by

Art Unit: 1734

the removal of portions of the marking material by a force, i.e., graving, selectively applied to the two layers of marking material while it is supported by the glass panel 1 (Figures 1-3; page 1, column 1, lines 31-48).

(3)

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-23 are allowed.

Claim 24 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Methods for the imaging of substrates having a substantially uniform imaging surface, such as those disclosed by U.S. Patent Nos. 6,258,199 to Lingamfelter et al.; 5,344,680 to Logan et al.; 5,312,645 to Dressler; 5,112,423 to Liebe, Jr.; 5,026,584 to Logan; and 3,826,167 to Pelet et al., are known in the art. Dressler, for example, discloses one method comprising the steps of: Providing an imperforate base layer; Applying two continuous marking layers and an adhesive layer onto the surface of the base layer; Applying a selectively applied force (cutting) to the marking material layers and adhesive layer remote from the base layer while the marking material layers and adhesive layer are supported by the base layer; Removing (weeding) nonimage areas of the marking material layers and adhesive layer from the base layer while leaving non-removed (image) portions of the marking material layers and adhesive layer on the base layer; Providing a substrate 36 having a substantially uniform imaging surface; Contacting the image portions of the marking material layers and adhesive layer supported on the base layer against the substantially uniform imaging surface of the substrate to bond the image portions thereto; and Transferring the image portions to the substrate by removing the base layer therefrom. Although Lingamfelter et al. discloses that such cut graphics are applicable to many types of substrates including glass, none of the prior art of record specifically teaches or suggests such a method wherein the step of contact and transfer comprises the direct contact of at least one of the two marking layers carried on the base material with the imaging surface of the substrate.

Art Unit: 1734

(4)

### Conclusion

The examiner has considered the references cited in the PCT document upon which this application is based. References C-H listed on Form PTO-892 have been cited by the examiner as having particular relevance to the subject matter at hand.

(5)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerry A. Lorengo whose telephone number is (703) 306-9172. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (703) 308-3853. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7115 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Primary Examiner

December 9, 2002